

displaying a visual indicator showing the combined persistence values of the first concept of interest and the second concept of interest at locations within the electronically stored document.

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

STATUS OF THE APPLICATION

Claims 1-5, 7-8, 10-15, 17-18, 20-25, 27-28, and 30-37 were pending in this application and examined.

Claim 37 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Aalbersberg (U.S. Patent 5,946,678). Claims 1-5, 7-8, 11-15, 17-18, 21-25, 27-28, 31, and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ball et al. ("Software Visualization in the Large", IEEE Computer, vol. 29, No. 4, pp. 33-43; "Ball") in view of Wroblewski et al. (U.S. Patent 5,479,600; "Wroblewski"). Claims 10, 20, 30, 32, 34, and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Aalbersberg in view of Wroblewski.

Applicant has amended claims 1-2, 10-11, 20-21, 30, 32, 34, and 36-37. Applicant submits that no new subject matter has been introduced by the amendments. Claims 1-5, 7-8, 10-15, 17-18, 20-25, 27-28, and 30-37 remain pending in this application after filing of this amendment.

THE DRAWINGS

A petition to accept color drawings under 37 CFR 1.84(a)(2) is being filed along with this amendment. Applicant requests that the petition be granted and that the color drawings be accepted for use in this application.

THE SPECIFICATION

The specification has been amended to insert language in the "BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE DRAWINGS" section of the specification indicating that the

application contains at least one drawing executed in color. No new subject matter has been added by the amendment.

INTERVIEW with the Examiner

Applicant would like to thank Examiner Paula for the telephonic interview regarding this application conducted on August 1, 2005. Applicant has amended the claims as discussed with the Examiner. A "Statement of Substance of Interview" is being filed along with this response.

THE CLAIMS

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 1

Applicant has amended claim 1 as discussed with the Examiner. Applicant submits that claim 1, as amended, is not made obvious by Wroblewski, Ball, or Aalbersberg, considered individually or in combination.

As amended, claim 1 recites displaying a visual indicator showing persistence values of a user-specified concept of interest at locations within an electronically stored document. The persistence values at the locations are determined based upon a number of occurrences of discussion of the user-specified concept at the locations within the document. Further, for a location within the electronically stored document, the visual indicator displays the persistence value of the user-specified concept of interest at that location relative to persistence values of the concept of interest at other locations in the document. The persistence value for a location thus provides a quantification of the level of concentration of the user-specified concept at that location within the document. Accordingly, the visual indicator enables a user to easily determine the concentration of a user-specified concept within the document. Also values associated with different locations can be compared to easily determine which location has a higher (or lower) level of concentration of the concept compared to other locations in the document.

Applicant submits that the features recited in independent claim 1 and identified above are not taught or made obvious by Wroblewski, Ball, or Aalbersberg, considered individually or in combination. Wroblewski teaches the display of vertical and horizontal scroll bars that indicate the vertical and horizontal locations of attributes in an electronic document. For example, as depicted in Fig. 2 of Wroblewski, scroll bar indicia 18 and 18a indicate the vertical and horizontal positions of the word "taxonomy" in the displayed document. Thus, Wroblewski is directed only towards displaying the positions or locations of attributes in a document. As discussed with the Examiner during the telephone interview, Applicant submits that Wroblewski does not teach or suggest displaying persistence values at locations within the document, as recited in claim 1, where the values are determined based upon a number of occurrences of discussion of a user-specified concept at locations in a document, and where the values reflect relative concentrations of the user-specified concept at various locations in the document. As discussed with the Examiner, displaying persistence values, as recited in claim 1, is substantially different from merely displaying vertical and horizontal positions as described in Wroblewski. Accordingly, Applicant submits that Wroblewski fails to disclose at least "displaying a visual indicator showing persistence values ..." as recited in claim 1. Applicant thus submits that Wroblewski fails to teach or suggest claim 1.

Applicant further submits that the above-identified deficiencies of Wroblewski are not cured by either Aalbersberg or Ball. Aalbersberg teaches techniques for displaying information that indicates the relevance or weight of a query word in the selection of a document. As described in Aalbersberg, a distinctive representation is uniquely associated with each query word in a search query. Then, for each document found by applying the search query, an indicator is displayed for the document that employs the same distinctive representation to indicate the relative contributions of the individual words from the query to the document. (See Aalbersberg, col. 1 lines 60 - col. 2 line 30; Fig. 2; Fig. 4).

As discussed with the Examiner during the telephone interview, Applicant submits that Aalbersberg is only concerned about displaying the weight of particular query words in the selection of a document -- Aalbersberg is not concerned about where and how the query words are distributed within a document. Unlike claim 1, Aalbersberg does not teach or

suggest displaying a visual indicator showing persistence values at locations within the document, where the values are determined based upon a number of occurrences of discussion of a user-specified concept at locations in a document, and where the values reflect relative concentrations of the user-specified concept at various locations in the document. Applicant thus submits that claim 1 is substantially different from the teachings of Aalbersberg.

Since neither Wroblewski nor Aalbersberg teach or suggest at least the feature of displaying a visual indicator showing persistence values of a concept at locations within a document, as recited in claim 1, even if the references were combined, the resultant combination would also fail to teach or suggest such a feature.

Further, Applicant submits that the deficiencies of Wroblewski and Aalbersberg are not cured by Ball. Like the other two references, Ball also fails to teach displaying a visual indicator showing persistence values of a concept at locations within a document. Accordingly, even if Wroblewski, Aalbersberg, and Ball were combined (even though there appears to be no motivation to do so), the resultant combination would still not teach or suggest displaying persistence values, as recited in claim 1.

Applicant thus submits that claim 1 is patentable over the cited references.

Claims 2-5, 7-8, 10-15, 17-18, 20-25, 27-28, and 30-36

Applicant submits that independent claims 10, 11, 20, 21, and 30, as amended, should be allowed for at least a similar rationale as discussed for allowing claim 1, and others.

Applicant submits that dependent claims 2-5, 7-8, and 31, which depend directly or indirectly from claim 1, should also be allowed for at least a similar rationale as discussed for allowing claim 1. Dependent claims 32, 34, and 36, which depend from claims 10, 20, and 30 respectively, should be allowed for at least a similar rationale as discussed for allowing claims 10, 20, and 30. Dependent claims 12-15, 17-18, and 33, which depend directly or indirectly from claim 11, should be allowed for at least a similar rationale as discussed for allowing claim 11. Dependent claims 22-25, 27-28, and 35, which depend directly or indirectly from claim 21, should be allowed for at least a similar rationale as discussed for allowing claim 21.

Applicant further submits that the dependent claims recite additional features that are not taught or suggested by the cited references, considered individually or in combination, and are thus allowable for additional reasons.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claim 37

Applicant has amended claim 37 as discussed with the Examiner. Applicant submits that claim 37, as amended, is not anticipated by Aalbersberg.

As recited in amended claim 37, persistence values of a first concept of interest at locations within a document are determined based upon the occurrences of discussion of the first concept of interest in the document. Further, persistence values of a second concept of interest at locations within the document are determined based upon the occurrences of discussion of the second concept of interest in the document. Combined persistence values of the first concept of interest and the second concept of interest at locations within the document are then determined based upon the persistence values of the first concept of interest and the persistence values of the second concept of interest. As described in the specification on page 6 line 27 through page 7 line 2, a combined persistence value may be determined by adding the persistence of two concepts, subtracting the persistence of two concepts, and the like. A visual indicator showing the combined persistence values at locations within the document is then displayed.

As already discussed above with respect to claim 1, Aalbersberg merely displays the weight of particular query words in the selection of a document does not teach or suggest anything about persistence values at locations within a document. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the features recited in claim 37 of determining persistence values of the first concept and determining persistence values of the second concept at locations within the document are not taught or suggested by Aalbersberg. Consequently, Applicant submits that Aalbersberg also does not teach or suggest the features of determining combined persistence values of a first concept of interest and a second concept of interest at locations within a document and displaying a visual indicator showing the combined persistence values. As a result, the features

recited in claim 37 of determining and displaying combined persistence values are also not taught or suggested by Aalbersberg.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that claim 37 is not anticipated by Aalbersberg for at least the reasons stated above.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 650-326-2400.

Respectfully submitted,

S. B. Kotwal

Sujit B. Kotwal
Reg. No. 43,336

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 650-326-2400
Fax: 650-326-2422
SBK:ajl
60551547 v2